Rambler, Alexis

From:

Sent:

To:

Cc:

Subject:

Alex <a1l1e1x@yahoo.com>
Saturday, December 26, 2020 10:40 PM
Dukes, Jerisha
Heather Smith; Katie Brown; Rebecca J. Dulin; Frank R. Ellerbe III; Samuel Wellborn; Knowles, Alex; Grube-Lybarker, Carri; Hall, Roger; Wessinger-Hill, JoAnne; Butler, David PSC_Contact
Re: [External] Re: Alex Kadoshnikov DN. 2020-218-E

Concerning the electric meter being moved from point "A" to point "B", I wanted to let take Energy that, I was granted permission by all parties. To begin with, everything Good morning to all that read this. Concerning the electric meter being moved from point "A" to point "B", I wanted to let both the Commission know and Duke Energy that, I was granted permission by all parties. To begin with, everything started with the Regulatory Staff. I had long conversations with them and was given the green light by them to move my meter. Next I asked permission from Duke Energy and was given the green light. I was asked to pay a \$314 fee non-refundable fee, that was paid the same day. I spoke with senior supervisions, and was given personal telephone numbers that if I ever had a question, I could reach out and talk to them. High seniors officers gave me the green light, and said it can only take place after payment would be made. I was advised to make a supervision of the payment would be made. can only take place after payment would be made. I was advised to make payment and send it to Charlotte. Instead I made the check out and had a supervisor come to my house to personally pick it up (they forwarded everything to Charlotte). The county also gave the green light and signed off on everything. Once all the work was complete, the county are signed off on everything. again came by and signed off on everything.

I was given the green light from beginning to end. Once a investor builds a million dollar home to resell for example and goes through all the proper steps, gets green lights from the county and everyone else. Then two weeks after completions of the project the county comes in and says "I'm sorry but we were wrong, you did not have permission to build here, the million dollar home has to be torn down." This is what Duke Energy is trying to do now. Duke Energy, The Regulatory Staff, The County, and maybe even other agencies that I am not aware of all gave the green light (there were a few parties working together to get this project accomplished). If there was an issue it should have been taken care of at that! time. Duke Energy accepted my payment for the project to proceed and gave me consent by doing so. The definition of consent is as follows: permission for something to happen or agreement to do something. There is no goin back now, it has been agreed too by all parties.

Once again I am humbly grateful for the ruling the commission made recently. I am working with experts now to testify with personal knowledge as far as the dangers of smart meters. I am very grateful that the case will be virtual in that it will be easier for these individuals to attend this hearing. Thank you from the bottom of my heart. Thank you also for your patience with me, as I am no lawyer, and for all your understanding.

Yours Truly,
Alex

On Wednesday, November 4, 2020, 12:02:42 PM EST, Dukes, Jerisha <jerisha.dukes@psc.sc.gov> wrote:

Good Afternoon Mr. Kadoshnikov,

Please note the following schedule, outlined in the "Prefile Testimony Letter":

- 1. The Defendant/Respondent and the Office of Regulatory Staff must prefile with the Commission 1 copy of direct testimony and exhibits of the Witnesses they intend to present and serve the testimony and exhibits of the Witnesses on all Parties of Record on or before November 5, 2020. (must be post-marked on or before this date).
- 2. The Complainant/Petitioner filing Rebuttal Testimony must prefile with the Commission 1 copy of the testimony and exhibits of the Witnesses it intends to present and serve the testimony and exhibits of the Witnesses on all

Parties of Record on or before November 17, 2020. (Rebuttal testimony and exhibits must be in the offices of the Commission and in the hands of the parties on this date).

3. The Defendant/Respondent and the ORS filing Surrebuttal Testimony must prefile with the Commission 1 copy of the testimony and exhibits of the Witnesses they intend to present and serve the testimony and exhibits the Witnesses on all Parties of Record on or before November 24, 2020. (Surrebuttal testimony and exhibits must be in the offices of the Commission and in the hands of the parties on this date).

Submitting your rebuttal testimony next Thursday will meet the Commission's rebuttal testimony deadline; however, as Complainant/Petitioner in this docket, your rebuttal testimony is not due until November 17, 2020.

You have also requested a phone call to inquire about deadlines, the order of meeting, and other miscellaneous questions. Attached to this email are the "Notice of Hearing and Prefile Testimony Deadlines" and "Prefile Testimony Letter," which outline the deadlines in this docket. Regarding your other questions, please be advised that all parties to this docket must participate in any conversation held with an attorney employed with the Commission. As such, please send your questions via email to all parties to this docket. Where possible and without giving legal advice, the Commission will work to answer your questions.

Without offering or providing legal advice, I offer the following limited procedural information to direct you to resources available to everyone. Article 8, "Practice and Procedure," Chapter 103 of the SC Code of State Regulations outlines the procedures which are required to be followed and practiced by all parties or persons appearing before or filing a matter with the Commission. You can also find a Pro Se Litigant Guide on the Commission's website

available to everyone. Article 8, "Practice and Procedure," Chapter 103 of the SC Code of State Regulations outlines the procedures which are required to be followed and practiced by all parties or persons appearing before or filing a matter with the Commission. You can also find a Pro Se Litigant Guide on the Commission's website (www.psc.sc.gov/publications/pro-se-litigant-guide). Lastly, you may conduct a search of the Commission's Docket Management System to find examples of pleadings submitted by parties in other dockets.

I hope the information outlined above proves helpful. Thank you for your follow-up and inquiry.

In accordance with Commission practices and procedures, should you respond to this emailing please remember to hit "reply all" so that there is no inadvertent, accidental ex parte

please remember to hit "reply all" so that there is no inadvertent, accidental ex parte communication in this Docket, regardless if such procedural communication may be exempt Q by statute.

With warm regards,

Jerisha Dukes, Esq.

Public Service Commission

State of South Carolina

101 Executive Center Drive, Suite 100

Columbia, SC 29210

Www.psc.se.gov

803-896-5100 (ph) | 803-896-5231 (f) | Jerisha.Dukes@psc.sc.gov

The information contained in this e-mail message is public and will be filed in the Docketing Management System (DMS) for the corresponding docketed matter. Any responsive e-mail message by you should also be filed by you in the DMS for this matter. If the reader of this message does by you should also be filed by you in the DMS for this matter. If the reader of this message does not want certain information, which is meant to be discussed only between the parties and not Public Service Commission of South Carolina (Commission) staff, please do not use "reply all" to this message. Any e-mail message involving the Commission or Commission staff is also subject to the provisions of Commission Order No. 2019-748 in Docket No. 2019-329-A and shall be published in the docket for this matter. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone at (803) 896-5100.

From: Alex <a111e1x@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 4, 2020 9:11 AM
To: Dukes, Jerisha -Jukes@psc.sc.gov>
Cc: Heather Smith <heather.smith@duke-energy.com>; Katie Brown <katie.brown2@duke-energy.com>; Bebecca J.
Dulin Rebecca J.
Dulin Rebecca J.
Dulin Rebecca J.
Dulin Rebecca J.
Sent: Wednesday, November 4, 2020 9:11 AM
To: Dukes, Jerisha -Jukes@psc.sc.gov>
Cc: Heather Smith <heather.smith@duke-energy.com>; Katie Brown <katie.brown2@duke-energy.com>; Bebecca J.
Dulin Rebecca J.
Dulin Rebecca J.
Dulin Rebecca J.
Subject: [External] Re: Alex Kadoshnikov DN. 2020-218-E

Good morning. I have been waiting for a phone call from the lawyer for the commission and now see that an email was sent instead. Public Service Commission of South Carolina (Commission) staff, please do not use "reply

Not knowing if the case would be heard before the commission, I sent an email reply to Duke Energy's request. I am grateful that the commission voted to hear my case. I was not aware that I had to have all my evidence in to the commission so that Duke Energy could come back with their arguments. I was hoping to discuss all of these procedures with the lawyer from the commission so that I would know what the exact next steps are.

I am asking the commission to give me till next Thursday to send everything I have against Duke Energy. If that is not possible, we can proceed as outlined of course.

I would still like a phone call from a lawyer so that I know exactly when everything is due, how the commission meeting will take place, and to get my basic questions answered.

Thank you so much for your time,

Alex Kadoshnikov

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

On Mon, Nov 2, 2020 at 7:58, Dukes, Jerisha

Lerisha Dukes @psc.sc.gov> wrote:

Good Morning Mr. Kadoshnikov,

The Commission received your phone call regarding legal questions. To avoid any potential ex parte communication, I am responding to you via email in lieu of returning your phone call. Please feel free to subrisk your question by emailing all parties on the communication. Thank you in advance for consideration of this request.

In accordance with Commission practices and procedures, please remember to hit "reply all" when responding so that there is no inadvertent, accidental ex parte communication in this Docket, regardless if such procedural communication may be exempt by statute.

With warm regards,

Jerisha Dukes, Esq.

Jerisha Dukes, Esq.

Public Service Commission

State of South Carolina

101 Executive Center Drive, Suite 100

Columbia, SC 29210

www.psc.sc.gov

803-896-5100 (ph) | 803-896-5231 (f) | Jerisha.Dukes@psc.sc.gov

From: Alvarez, Colanthia < Colanthia. Alvarez@psc.sc.gov >

Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2020 11:10 AM

To: Wessinger-Hill, JoAnne < JoAnne.Hill@psc.sc.gov >; Butler, David < David.Butler@psc.sc.gov >; Stark,

David <<u>david.stark@psc.sc.gov</u>>; Dukes, Jerisha <<u>Jerisha.Dukes@psc.sc.gov</u>>; Minges, Josh

<Josh.Minges@psc.sc.gov>

Subject: Alex Kadoshnikov DN. 2020-218-E

Will someone call Mr. Kadoshnikov, regarding legal questions @ 864-473-7517

Thanks

Colanthia B. Alvarez

Clark's Offica